

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and respectfully submit that the application is allowable in view of the following remarks.

A final Office action and subsequent advisory action have been issued in which claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11 were rejected. Applicants note, with appreciation, the identification in the advisory action of claim 10 as allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of the claims from which it depends. Accordingly, claim 10 has been so rewritten as independent claim 13. Claim 1 has also been amended, and new claim 12 has been added to the present application. The amendments made by way of this amendment address the issues raised in the final Office action and advisory action as discussed below.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,863,433 to Behrends, applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to claim 1 herein place that claim, and its dependent claims, in a condition for allowance. Behrends is directed to reciprocating subsurface-flow constructed wetlands and a method for operating said wetlands for treatment of wastewater. Substrates are provided with microbial biofilms and are exposed to atmospheric oxygen concentrations at frequent and intermittent intervals via sequential and recurrent filling and draining of paired contiguous wetland cells. "[R]iver gravel and/or limestone, and/or any other appropriate substrate" will suffice as the substrate according to Behrends. During the drain cycles, oxygen is rapidly supplied to the de-watered, and relatively thin (from about one micron to about two millimeters thick), microbial biofilms residing on the substrates. This exposure to oxygen promotes growth of aerobic bacteria that forms a portion of the microbial biofilms on the substrate. See Col. 7, ln. 66 – Col. 8, ln. 21.

As part of the Behrends disclosure, numerous detailed examples are provided for creating and operating the constructed wetlands to treat wastewater. The examples differ from each other in the type and size of substrate used. In three of the examples, washed river gravel was used as the substrate, and in another example, limestone gravel was used. In none of the examples was a combination of more than one type of substrate used. Further, the only mention of the distribution of the substrate in Behrends was of the size of the substrate used in different regions of the constructed wetlands. A stated objective of Behrends was to prevent plugging of pore void space by providing "at least two size grades of backfill material [substrate] such that the large size grade is distributed on the lower (bottom) portion of the

Appl. No. 09/776,298
Amdt. Dated March 10, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 1, 2003

PATENT AF
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 1724

treatment cells and the smaller size fraction is distributed on the top (upper) portion of the treatment cells." Col. 8, ln. 58-62. No other mention is made of the distribution of the backfill material. Thus, Behrends is silent about distributing the substrate material in a manner to preferentially precipitate metals from an aqueous solution on one substrate (the precipitating agent) over another available substrate (the neutralizing agent), as claimed in amended claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Behrends.

Similarly, claims 1-6 were rejected in the final Office action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 5,298,173 to Burke; 6,033,562 to Budeit; and 4,793,276 to Stafford. Again, applicants respectfully submit that the recent amendments to the claims render this rejection moot since the combination of references fails to teach every feature of the amended claims. For reasons analogous to those discussed above, the combination fails to teach distributing the at least one neutralizing agent and the at least one precipitating agent in a manner to preferentially precipitate the metals from the aqueous solution, as claimed in amended claim 1.

Further, applicants respectfully submit that Stafford is a non-analogous reference that cannot properly be relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. This reference is neither in the field of applicants' endeavor nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which applicants were concerned. Stafford is also not a reference that logically would have commended itself to the applicants' attention in considering their problem. And in view of the amendments to the claims above, Stafford appears to be even less analogous to the claimed invention.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Burke, Budeit and Stafford, lack sufficient motivation therein to justify their combination. Each reference, individually and when combined, teach away from the present invention. The neutralizing agent of Burke, which is a block of gypsum and lime, is placed in bodies of water that are to be treated. Lime is time-released from the blocks to elevate the pH of the water. Increasing the pH causes certain metals to precipitate from the water, presumably onto the blocks due to the absence of an accompanying precipitating agent. Accumulation of metal on the neutralizing agent is a process sought to be retarded by the provision of the precipitating agent as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-6 are patentable over the combination of Burke, Budeit and Stafford.

Appl. No. 09/776,298
Amdt. Dated March 10, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 1, 2003

PATENT AF
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 1724

Claims 1-5 and 7 were also rejected in the final Office action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burke, Budiet and Stafford in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 1,742,110 to Weihe or 5,863,422 to Watten. In light of the amendments to the claims, however, applicants submit that the combination including Weihe or Watten also fails to teach every feature of the present invention. Again, the combined references fail to teach distributing the at least one neutralizing agent and at least one precipitating agent as claimed in amended claim 1. The remarks above are equally applicable to these combinations of references, and are incorporated herein by reference.

Also applicable to the combinations including Weihe or Watten are the applicants' remarks concerning the inclusion of Stafford, which applicants deem to be a non-analogous reference relied upon to support a rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. §103. And again, applicants respectfully submit that the combination including Watten teaches away from the present invention by addressing the accumulation of precipitated metals in an alternative fashion. Watten discloses controlling the accumulation of metal precipitates on the neutralizing agent particles by periodically colliding the particles together. Forces generated by the collisions flake the metals from the particles. There is no mention in Watten of a precipitating agent to divert the precipitation of metals preferentially away from the neutralizing agent according to the present invention. Similarly, Weihe does not teach the inclusion of a precipitating agent as claimed in amended claim 1.

Independent claims 1, 3, 12 and 13 should be in a condition for allowance in light of the amendments to the claims and the remarks above. The remaining dependent claims 2, 4, 5 and 7-11 should be allowable for the limitations therein and for the limitations in the claims from which they depend. Notice to that effect is hereby requested.

Appl. No. 09/776,298
Amdt. Dated March 10, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 1, 2003


PATENT AF
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 1724

In the event that minor issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to arrange for a telephone interview to expedite disposition of this application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500959 (089498.0372) for any fees required under 35 C.F.R. §1.16 or 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

ROETZEL & ANDRESS

By: 
Donald J. Firca, Jr., Reg. No. 48,140

222 South Main Street
Akron, OH 44308
330/849-6779

Date: March 10, 2004

089498.0372
1148518_1